

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 6-12 and 15-19 are pending in the present application. Claims 4, 5, 13, 14 and 20 have been canceled and claims 1, 10 and 19 have been amended by the present Amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1-3, 5-12 and 14-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Duruoz et al. in view of Morel and Acharya, which is respectfully traversed.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for discussing this application with Applicant's Representative on October 15, 2007. During the discussion, the differences between the present invention and the applied art were discussed. No agreement was reached pending the Examiner's further review when the response is filed. Comments presented during the discussion are reiterated below.

Amended independent claim 1 is directed to a method for resizing an image using an inverse discrete cosine transform (IDCT). The method includes (a) checking an encoding type of an original source image and an encoding type of discrete cosine transformed macro blocks, (b) selectively converting the encoding type of said macro blocks so that the encoding type of said macro blocks coincides with the encoding type of said original source image, only if the checked two encoding types are different, (c) selectively enlarging said converted macro blocks and macro blocks that have not been converted using the inverse discrete cosine transform, and (d) merging the enlarged macro blocks to thereby enlarge the original source image. Independent claims 10 and 19 include similar features in a varying scope.

These features are supported at least by Figures 10 and 11 and the corresponding description in the specification. For example, Figure 10 illustrates frame type macro blocks and field type macro blocks. As shown in the lower portion of Figure 10, the field type macro blocks are converted to frame type macro blocks so that the converted macro blocks coincide with the encoding type of the original source image (a frame type picture). Figure 10 illustrates the frame

type macro blocks not being converted, because they have the same encoding type as the original frame type picture. Thus, the present invention selectively converts encoding type of the macro blocks so that the encoding type of the macro blocks coincides with the encoding type of the original image, only if the checked encoding types are different.

Item (4) of the Office Action indicates it is obvious to match a coding type of the input image according to the encoding type of the original image in order to decode it. However, as discussed in the Background of the present specification, the related art did not perform the conversion process as claimed by the present invention. That is, as shown in Figure 4 of the related art, when the original source image was a frame type picture, the frame type picture was broken into field type macro blocks, the field type macro blocks were then enlarged, and then combined again to form a frame type picture. As shown in Figure 4 of the related art, the related art did not perform the conversion process as in the present invention. Figure 5 illustrates a similar concept related to the original source image being a field type picture where a field type picture is broken into frame type macro blocks, which are then enlarged and combined to produce a field type picture again. However, when the enlarged picture is displayed by a progressive scan scheme, the odd-field image has alternating black and white lines and the even-field image has only gray lines, which is completely different from the original image (see Figure 5 and paragraph [017]).

Further, it is respectfully submitted the applied art also does not teach or suggest the features of the present invention. That is, the applied art does not teach or suggest selectively converting the encoding type of macro blocks as claimed by the present invention, nor selectively enlarging the converted and non-converted blocks as claimed. That is, Duruo et al. merely teach a conventional encoding process and Morel merely teaches converting a field frame format into a frame format and *vice versa*. Acharya also does not teach or suggest the selective converting process of the present invention.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted independent claims 1, 10 and 19 and the claims depending therefrom are allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact David A. Bilodeau, Reg. No. 42,325, at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: December 3, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By David Bilodeau #42,325
Esther H. Chong
Registration No.: 40,953
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant

FILED IN 2950-0266P
REPLY TO OA No. 42,325